



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,676	11/21/2003	Young-Joo Kim	8734.260.00 US	9071
30827	7590	04/03/2007	EXAMINER	
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP 1900 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006			PHAM, THANHHA S	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2813		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	04/03/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/717,676	KIM, YOUNG-JOO	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Thanhha Pham	2813	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1/17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 18-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to Applicant's Amendment dated 12/29/2006.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

**1. Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Jung [US 6,177,301]**

Jung (abstract, fig 7C & 8, cols 1-7 particularly col 3 lines 9-18) discloses a liquid crystal display panel of a display device including a plurality of thin transistor (82a) comprising a substrate (81) and a polycrystalline silicon film having laterally arranged silicon grains (73) on the substrate. \*\*\*Notice: It is noted that process limitation in claims 18 and 19 of "forming amorphous silicon film.... crystallizing the amorphous silicon film to form a polycrystalline silicon film having lateral arranged silicon grains and defects sites formed along grain boundaries using a sequentially lateral solidification crystallization method... performing a surface treatment to the polycrystalline silicon film wherein the sequential lateral solidification crystallization method includes at least a first laser beam having a first energy density that completely melts a first uncocrystallized portion of the amorphous silicon film and melts a first crystallized portion of the amorphous silicon film; and the surface treatment includes application of a second laser beam having a second energy density that partially melts an entire surface of the polycrystalline silicon film" does not carry patent weight in a claim drawn to structure because distinct structure is not necessarily produced. See *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964 (Fed. Cir. 1985). In addition, a "product by process" limitation is directed to the product per se, no matter how

*actually made, in re Hirao, 190 USPQ 15 and 17 (footnote 3). See also In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1972); In re Luck, 177 USPQ 523; In re Fessmann, 180 USPQ 324 (CCPA 1974); In re Avery, 186 USPQ 161; In re Wertheim, 191 USPQ 90; and In re Marosi et al., 218 USPQ 289 (Fed. Cir. 1983); all of which made clear that it is the patentability of the final product per se which must be determined in a "product by process" claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in "product by process" claims or not.*

"Even though product -by[-] process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based upon the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product is made by a different process." In re Thorpe, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citations omitted).

### ***Response to Arguments***

**2. Applicant's arguments filed 12/26/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.**

► In regard to Applicant's argument on page 4, Applicant argues that claims 18 and 19 are allowable over Jung since Jung does not teach of suggest "a polycrystalline silicon having laterally arranged silicon grains and defects sites formed along grain boundaries". The argument is not persuasive since limitation of "defects sites formed along grain boundaries" is a part of process limitation and does not have a patent weight. In addition:

- text [0033] shows "defects sites along grain boundaries" causes electrical characteristics problem in thin film transistor.
- text [0037] shows "defect sites being removed by surface treatment.

***Conclusion***

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanhha Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-1696. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday and Thursday 9:00AM - 9:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Whitehead Jr can be reached on (571) 272-1702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thanhha Pham  
Patent Examiner



THANHHA S. PHAM  
PRIMARY EXAMINER